UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

A Church That Is Different

The Ordeal of the Jew - - *David M. Bloch*

Humanism and World Leadership - -
- - - - - - - *Archie J. Bahm*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXXIX NUMBER 5

Chicago, July, 1943

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 15 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Archie J. Bahm: Professor of Philosophy, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.

David M. Bloch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian Congregational Church in Flatbush, New York; frequent contributor to various liberal journals.

C. A. Hawley: Formerly head of the Department of New Testament, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Omaha; now pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

James M. Yard: Executive Director of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

American Purpose—C. W. REESE 67
Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 68
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 71

ARTICLES—

The Ordeal of the Jew—DAVID M. BLOCH 71
A Church That Is Different 73
Humanism and World Leadership—ARCHIE J. BAHM 77

THE STUDY TABLE—

Authentic Voice—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 79
The Unfinished Business of Democracy—JAMES M. YARD 79
A Strong and Quiet Optimism—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 79
A Guide to Better Preaching—C. A. HAWLEY 80

CORRESPONDENCE—

In Reply to Mr. Collier—SHERMAN D. WAKEFIELD 80
Peace Terms—Questions for Pacifists—VICTOR S. YARROS 80

THE FIELD—

Colwell Made Dean of the Faculties 66
Western Conference Notes 66

The Field

Colwell Made Dean of the Faculties

Ernest C. Colwell, Dean of the Divinity School, has been appointed to the additional post of Dean of the Faculties of the University of Chicago, effective July 1, President Robert M. Hutchins announced recently. In this capacity Dean Colwell will coöperate with Mr. Hutchins and Emery T. Filbey, vice president, in the educational administration of the University.

Doctor Colwell, member of the Divinity School faculty since 1930, was appointed Dean in 1939. A New Testament scholar who has made important contributions to linguistic and manuscript studies, he has been a proponent of higher standards of theological education and a leading advocate of the necessity of a strong general education as a base for theological study.

As Dean of the Divinity School, he was influential in the recent agreement of the theological schools associated with the University to form the Federated Theological Faculty, which constitutes the largest Protestant theological faculty in the country. Through the federation, the Divinity School, the Chicago Theological Seminary, Disciples Divinity House, and Meadville Theological Seminary, while retaining independence in administration and control, have pooled their faculties to strengthen their effectiveness in teaching ministers of all denominations.

Doctor Colwell will continue as Dean of the Divinity School.

Western Conference Notes

G. Richard Kuch, formerly president of the American Unitarian Youth organization, has been called to the pastorate of The Church of the Christian Union, Rockford, Illinois.

The Reverend Francis M. Ruland, who was graduated from Colgate-Rochester Divinity School and who while taking orientation courses at Meadville Theological School has been serving as student minister at Shelbyville, has been called to the pastorate of The First Unitarian Church, Sioux City, Iowa.

The Reverend George Marshfield, who was graduated from the Chicago Theological Seminary and who has held positions in the field of religious education and with the YMCA, has accepted a call to the pastorate of The People's Church of Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

The Reverend Eugene A. Luening, of the Meadville class of 1943, has been called to The Unitarian Church of Amherst, Mass.

The Reverend John Frank Hayward, of the Meadville class of 1943, has been appointed as a chaplain in the Navy.

The Reverend Robert Lee Zoerheide, of the Meadville class of 1943, has accepted a call to the Universalist Church in Hoopeston, Illinois.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIX JULY, 1943 No. 5

AMERICAN PURPOSE

In the first place, America proposes to maintain its existence as a free nation. A corollary of this is that our first war aim is *victory*. On these matters we should be perfectly clear. An Axis victory would mean intolerable restrictions on our life as a free country. We do not intend for our grand experiment to be suddenly brought to an end. We fight for our existence and our aim is victory.

In the second place, America proposes to build from its good beginnings still more noble political and social structures. We know only too well that we are not all that we should be. We are keenly conscious of the flaws in our structure. But we intend to remedy these defects; and we want a free future in which to do it. We know that an Axis victory would close the door to democratic progress for a century or more, and that a United Nations victory will leave the door open for democratic development.

In the third place, America proposes to make possible the freedom of other nations. These nations may not be all that we could wish for as our world neighbors. But they, like us, cannot become what their best minds and hearts want them to become unless the fear of Axis tyranny is removed from them. We want a free world.

In the fourth place, America proposes to assure an outcome of the present struggle that will make possible the organization and management of the world in behalf of security and abundance, of happiness and peace. To bring about this desirable end, we shall need more than victory. We shall need to abandon utterly our traditional isolationism and timidity. We shall have to realize that we are no longer young, that we have grown to manhood, and that we cannot avoid our proper share and leadership in the management of world affairs. This means that while winning victories on the battle fronts of the world, we must also win at home the victories that will assure all men that we mean the "four freedoms," that we mean "emancipation," that we mean the "Bill of Rights," and that we mean the "Declaration of Independence."

CURTIS W. REESE

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

The Supreme Court never seemed so great, nor our American democracy so glorious, as on Flag Day (June 14th) when the Court reversed its decision in the famous Gobitis case, and at last declared that under the Bill of Rights public school children could not be compelled to salute the American flag if this ceremony conflicted with their religious beliefs. In this ruling, handed down by an impressive 6 to 3 decision, the Court upheld the challenge by members of the sect of Jehovah's Witnesses of a flag salute regulation enacted by the West Virginia Board of Education. There was nothing in the Jehovah's Witnesses group itself to win the favor of the Court. Arthur Krock, in an article in the *New York Times* declaring that in this decision "the Supreme Court rose to its full height as champion of the lowly [and] the laws," spoke of the sect as "thoroughly unpatriotic, even subversive." But the principle of freedom under the Constitution, of religious freedom which guarantees to the humblest and most non-conformist among us the right to worship their own God in their own way, was central; and even in time of war, and with the flag as the occasion of dispute, the Court vindicated this principle. Here is America at her best, highest, and noblest. One need never despair of the republic, nor yet of humanity, so long as such an event as this is possible.

II

The Food Conference at Hot Springs has interested me more than any other contemporary event. Not the progress of the war, not the diplomatic atttempts at appeasement of Joseph Stalin, not the multitudinous discussions of plans for a post-war world have seemed to me so important as this meeting of minds on the food question. It was statesmanship which called this Conference together—the kind of statesmanship which, if it prevails to the end, can still save mankind from death. What impresses me about the Food Conference is the fact that it has brought dozens of nations into a single room to deal with the most momentous problem now facing mankind—the problem, namely, as to how men and women the world around are going to be kept alive after this war. Even military questions are comparatively insignificant as compared to this problem, for what avails it to win a war of which there are no survivors? Lloyd George, it may be remembered, was persuaded to let food into Belgium in the last war when it was proved to him that, if the food were denied, his conquering armies would find only "skeletons" in the land. And what can you do with skeletons? In the same way there was no room for hatred and revenge in the deliberations of this parley on food. Only cool, calm reason, and quick compassion, could serve as motives in such a gathering. For in the last analysis, in spite of all our wild talk about destroying our enemies, it becomes necessary to keep them alive after the peace, if not actually before, lest in their process of dying of starvation and pestilence, they infect us with the scourge which devours them. It must be conceded that the Conference got off to a terribly bad start in the arbitrary denial of access to the press. Why reporters who are daily keeping military secrets of the greatest importance should not have been trusted with first-hand information about food conditions still remains a matter that is hard to understand. Happily, persistent protests broke down some of the barriers, and information of importance was made available. At the close came a blaze of glory—the recognition that joint action among the nations was essential to the solution of the food problem, that an abundance economy could alone feed the peoples of the world, and that an interim committee should begin work now for proper action after the war. This Conference, all in all, was a good augury of what may happen after the fighting is done.

III

The dissolution of the Commintern by Soviet Russia has great outward significance. Whether it has any inner or real significance, whether it will change Stalin's foreign policies by so much as a jot or a tittle, remains to be seen. The Russian dictator has before this made a fine pretense of doing something when as a matter of fact he was doing nothing. Nor is it to be believed that he will lack representatives and agents in foreign countries when he has work to do in Russia's interest. The Communist Party here in America, for example, be it official or unofficial, avowed or disavowed, can be counted upon to do the will of the Kremlin, which is the government of its first allegiance. But the formal dissolution of the Commintern is nevertheless a gesture of first-class importance. Certainly it binds the Soviets to the alliance of the United Nations far closer than before. It is from this standpoint that it would be interesting to know what was the *quid pro quo* of this action. What did Russia get paid for taking this step, and who paid it? That as astute and realistic a statesman as Joseph Stalin staged this performance for nothing, is not to be believed for a single moment. Things are simply not done that way in the world of diplomacy. "Earth gets its price for what earth gives us," says Lowell. The same is true of governments, especially in time of war. Was Stalin guaranteed a free hand in Europe after the war? Were his claims to Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania, and parts of Poland duly recognized? Was he prom-

ised access to the Mediterranean, or predominance in Jugoslavia? It all reminds us of the Secret Treaties in the last war—the way they were made, and the way they rose to plague us when the war was done. As I ponder this event, and other events in the history of Russia these last four years, I find myself praying desperately that Stalin is as disinterested as his apologists say he is—that the Russian dictator, like his heroic people, is fighting for survival, and will ask for nothing more than the salvation of the integrity and independence of his country. But even as I pray, my burnt hand pains me, and reminds me to fear the fire. The whole story of Soviet Russia in this war is being told not by current events which are only partly disclosed, least of all by the "Mission to Moscow" film which is shameless propaganda. It is history which will tell the tale. And that's a long way off!

IV

What happens to people when they support a war is shown by a group of twenty Quakers, writing to the *Friends Intelligencer,* who, in the interest of war, repudiate the fundamental Christian doctrine of "the universal responsiveness of men to good will." This war against Hitler is justified, they say, because there are men, "millions" of them in Germany, who are beyond all the redemptive influences of love. Jesus bade us to "love [our] enemies, and do them good, despairing of no man" (Luke VI:35). But these Quakers say "No," thereby asserting that there are men who have not the divine spirit within them. A still more shocking illustration of what war does to us, I find in a local newspaper article describing the commencement exercises at a certain college in New York State. At these exercises, the address to the graduates was given by the Governor of another state. This political leader, in high office in this country, spoke of military service in relation to Christian training, and he said, among other things:

> In the case of the soldier coming from a Christian college, it is essential that he rationalize the problem of war, so that as a fighter he may become proficient at his trade, which is the business of killing.

Again, this Governor said:

> Modern warfare is certainly as much a business of killing or being killed as war has ever been at its most ferocious phase in history, and a lusty desire on the part of the American soldier to kill in the cause of self-preservation is perhaps today his most needed requirement. All this, of course, involves a vast but necessary change from peacetime to wartime psychology. Nevertheless, in my judgment, it is not an unchristian change.

I think I could stand such stuff as this if it were not hitched up with Christianity. War has a case, and today a strong case. There is an argument for killing as the unavoidable business of the hour. Most men see this struggle against Hitler as a terrible necessity, and they can tell you from their viewpoint why. But to "rationalize the problem of war" into a Christian doctrine, to describe "a lusty desire . . . to kill" as a Christian virtue, this is to my mind sheer blasphemy and horror. Justify war if you can and will, but please, for decency's sake, leave Christianity out! Our one hope of ever getting rid of war is that of making Christianity at last triumphant over it.

V

Much of the controversy in the churches these days turns on the question of Christianity in relation to the war and its outcome. If this war is lost, or even not won, say many of the church leaders, then Christianity will be destroyed and disappear. This declaration is based, and accurately based, on the sheer paganism of Hitler and the Nazis. Both to Catholics and Protestants, not to speak of Jews, the Fuehrer has expressed a hostility which can only be described as a phobia. He would destroy religion if he could! But what is the plight of Christianity these days that it is willing to concede that, under any circumstances, it can be destroyed by a man like Hitler? Grant to this direful conqueror, for the sake of argument, a victory as great as that of the barbarians who destroyed Rome, is that going to mean the end of the church of Christ? The Jews do not talk this way about their faith! They have suffered everything that cruelty and hate can bring against mankind. Their tortures surpass description, and their losses calculation. Yet do they survive, as they have survived many another horror in centuries gone by, and look with unshaken confidence into the future. Nor do the Christians who have faced and endured Hitler talk in this defeatist fashion. It is from American Christians, who have suffered nothing, that there comes this complaint about Christianity disappearing if Hitler triumphs. In Norway, which writhes beneath the rod of Nazi tyranny, the church not only holds its own, but has defied and subdued the mightiest power of the enemy. In Germany itself, where Hitler has ruled supreme for a period of more than ten ghastly years, Catholics and Protestants carry on. If the Gospel cannot survive in the churches in Nazidom, then it will survive in the concentration camps. And if it cannot survive in the concentration camps, then it will survive in catacombs to match those of ancient Rome. How dare these faint-hearted American Christians take on their lips or in their hearts the name of Jesus, who survived the cross of Calvary? Christianity succumb even to such a horror as a Nazi victory in this war? Not if it is the Christianity of Christ, of Peter, of Paul, of Augustine who wrote *The City of God* as Rome fell, of St. Francis, of John Huss, of George Fox! Empires have risen and fallen, conquerors have come and gone, but Christianity goes on forever. If not, then is it not worth saving, and in this hour of dread extremity our religion is vain.

VI

The problem of civil liberties is never more interesting or important than at that point where reconciliation must be effected between the liberties of the citizen on the one hand, and the right of the government to protect itself from damage and destruction on the other. All of us would agree that foreign agents should be registered and their propaganda identified. There can be no dissent to the proposition that censorship is justified in the case of military information of value to the enemy. Who would object to a reasonable censorship of communication with foreign countries by mail, cable, and radio? Especially is the radio important in areas under military control and in short-wave broadcasts. Here are points at which the government must be vigilant and even arbitrary. But what about the extension of censorship to domestic mails, radio, and the press, and the present Post Office censorship of printed matter without adequate court review? What happens when all aliens are registered in this country as though they were foreign agents? Then there is that baffling dilemma of opinions and utterances inciting to illegal acts. When do opinions and utterances incite to violence and disorder, and what constitutes the occasion described by Justice Holmes in his famous decision as to "a clear and present danger"? There are those who would give the government, in such matters, the benefit of every doubt. If there is any mistake to be made, they say, let it be made in the interest of society! Such persons argue, with great effect, that liberty should be absolutely denied to those who do not themselves believe in liberty—*e.g.*, the Communists, who, if they took power in this country, would abrogate forthwith the Bill of Rights! But those who argue thus are guilty of grossly exaggerating the danger arising from individuals and minority groups of this type. The real danger is from the arrogance and power of government, as amply illustrated by what has happened in Germany, Italy, and Russia. The rise of totalitarianism in our time points the moral and adorns the tale. We must start out in this matter with the concept of freedom—the right of the citizen to free speech, free press, free religion, as the essence of what comports with human dignity and opportunity. Whenever the government would restrict or infringe upon any of these freedoms, then the government must prove its case. It must be assumed, in other words, that liberty will remain absolute, unless the government can prove "a clear and present danger" to the life of the republic. The government, in every case involving the rights of man, must be presumed guilty until it is proved innocent. Not otherwise can we be safe from the encroachments of power.

VII

All praise to Wendell Willkie for one of the great books of modern times! Just as a publishing phenomenon, *One World* is something of a miracle. Best-seller novels have more than once sold in millions of copies—*Uncle Tom's Cabin, Ben Hur, In His Steps, Gone With the Wind* are conspicuous examples! But how often has a non-fiction book or pamphlet gotten into this class? I can think of no parallel since Thomas Paine's immortal *Common Sense,* which was published on January 10, 1776, and in a few weeks had sold 500,000 copies in a population of not more than three million souls. "Everybody who could read at all," wrote Theodore Parker in later years, "read *Common Sense.*" But the parallel is something more than that of mere numbers. There is a striking comparison in the character of the two works, and perhaps in their place in history. Paine's pamphlet appeared in the midst of the Revolutionary War, in a time of confusion and uncertainty when men's minds were not clear on the ultimate issues involved in that great struggle. Paine argued flatly and fervently for independence from the British crown, for "a new nation conceived in liberty," and persuaded his compatriots, including George Washington, to this conviction. The Declaration of Independence followed just six months later! Now, in the midst of this greater war, at an hour of doubt as to aims and purposes, there comes another great man to write another great book to stir the hearts of men. Mr. Willkie has seen a vision—that this whole world must be free, not only of its enemies in arms but of its imperialistic masters and exploiters as well; and that a free world, if it is to survive, must be a united world, for of the world today, as of our country yesterday, it must be said that it cannot exist "half-slave and half-free." The East—Korea, China, India, Burma, Java—must henceforth be equal with the West, in the great new world which is to be "one world" of liberty and light. Mr. Willkie's book has a twofold significance. It shows, on the one hand, that we have a great man among us. Mr. Willkie comes as a leader who has seen a vision and undertaken a mission, at a time when leadership, in the creative and idealistic sense of the word, is failing us. It shows, on the other hand, that the American people are hungry for the ideas of peace and brotherhood which Mr. Willkie is giving them. The people have pitifully lifted up their faces, and have not been fed. What else can explain the well-nigh unprecedented reception given to *One World?* Again I say, all praise to this man! His words are inspired and his work a service of humanity.

"In our country, as everywhere else, it will be found that, in the long run, ignorant voters are powder and ball for the demagogues. . . . The unvarying testimony of history is, that the nations which win the most renowned victories in peace and war are those which provide ample means of popular education."

Rutherford B. Hayes—1880.

Jottings

The Vatican, in a recent broadcast, reminded the world of the Sermon on the Mount. Quoting particularly the injunction, "Love your enemies and do good to them that hate you," the broadcast said, "Remember this today when, all the world over, you are asked to hate your enemies."

The pleasant notion that war stimulates scientific research has been blasted by the testimony of two of the greatest of American scientists. Thus, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, Nobel Prize winner, says "Ninety-nine per cent of scientific inventions have not been the result of the stimulus of war. War distorts science, wasting energies on things not beneficial to humanity." This judgment is echoed by Dr. Thomas H. Morgan, another Nobel Prize winner. "We didn't need a war to stir us up," he says. "We had plenty to do without it."

Can any one question the usefulness of religion when one listens to the radio and discovers that religion is the only interest that can present its programs without advertising? News commentaries, lectures, symphony concerts, opera performances, dramas, stories, all these may be wantonly intruded upon by vendors of cigarettes, soaps, lotions, and laxatives—but not religion. It may be that religion will in the end be the sole influence to save radio from being a mere billboard of the air.

Well, well! At last there are indications that liquor, like food and fuel, may be rationed. It seems incredible, in this booze-ridden country—but why not? Liquor uses raw materials, engages manpower, crams transportation facilities—and debauches the health and efficiency of the nation. Rationing should be only a first step toward prohibition.

The Yorkshire town of Selby, in England, has refused to raise money for the war by asking the public to buy stamps and stick them on a bomb to be dropped on Germany. Canon A. E. M. Glover, formerly vicar of a bombed church in Hull, said, "I remember saying, after a very bad night in Hull, 'I never want any German man, woman, or child to go through what I have gone through.'"

Churchill still remains the incomparable orator, and Roosevelt the incomparable broadcaster. And as far as the East is from the West, so far is oratory from broadcasting. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Ordeal of the Jew

DAVID M. BLOCH

It is almost a Herculean task for a Jew in these troublesome times to take up the problem of his race. With the war raging, and so many other problems pressing for a solution, the Jewish question is likely to be of little interest to the world at large. Besides, the issue is so confusing that no matter what one might say on the subject, it is likely to be misinterpreted by Christians and Jews alike.

Yet how can one remain silent when one's people are literally threatened with annihilation, and the light of liberty is everywhere in danger of being extinguished? Even in our own United States anti-Semitism has raised its ugly head and is doing its utmost to spread dissension and undermine our faith in the democratic way of life.

What makes it so easy for the anti-Semites, who in the last few years had become quite vociferous, to get a hearing, is the fictitious conception that the populace has of the Jew. Due to the many contradictory, weird, and fantastic tales invented about him in every generation, the average Gentile accustomed himself to look upon the Jew not as a man of real flesh and blood, but as upon some strange being from another world. Not being able to understand that strange being, the ordinary Christian is naturally suspicious of him. He is ready, therefore, at all times, particularly when there is a crisis, to accept as truisms all evil rumors about the mysterious stranger. The notorious, libelous "Protocols of Zion," long ago discredited and proved to be a forged document, is still quoted verbatum in anti-Semitic literature and taken seriously by a great many people. At the least provocation, the Jew is still referred to as a "Shylock," "Judas," or "Christ-killer."

There is no denying that there is a certain type of Jew who deserves to be held in the utmost contempt. While he is to be found chiefly among businessmen, big and small, he is also not rare among the professionals. Products of Christian hate and capitalistic greed, such Jews cherish neither their own religion or culture nor the religion or culture of the country they reside in. Worshipping no other God but Mammon, they dedicate their entire lives to pecuniary gain. They are a disgrace to the race!

To try to whitewash them, as certain Jewish apologists often do, only arouses suspicion among well-meaning Christians. For the sake of veracity those miscreants ought to be exposed and severely censored.

But surely the Jewish race as a whole should not be made to suffer for the sins of the few. It is high time that the vile insults and brazen lies flaunted at the race be stopped! Such scurrilous attacks against a people who have contributed so much to civilization are inexcusable. As long as this is allowed to go on it will be extremely difficult for Jews and Christians ever to come to a better understanding and a sane solution found to the Jewish problem.

The problem is not altogether difficult to solve if the Jew would be viewed in the proper perspective and due consideration given to his material as well as spiritual needs. But that is precisely what very few leaders of

thought who tackle the Jewish question ever do. Most of them seem to lack vision and understand neither the nature of the Jew nor his relation to modern life.

To accuse the Jew, as even an H. G. Wells, or a Bernard Shaw does, of having a superiority complex, because in certain parts of the Old Testament the race is referred to as "God's Elect," is simply absurd. Neither the Hebrew prophets nor any of the spiritual leaders of Israel since them ever put forth such claims. While some orthodox Jews may still harbor the innocent illusion of being God's chosen people, it is not taken seriously by the race as a whole. The modern, enlightened Jew refuses to believe that he has been selected by Providence to be forever the moral guardian of humanity. He is quite willing to share his laurels with the rest of mankind.

But the majority of the assimilationists are not exactly resentful because the Jew considers himself superior to others. They would readily overlook this transgression even if it were true. What these deluded intellectuals cannot stomach, is the Jew's obstinancy in refusing to give up his identity. They cannot comprehend why he should still persist in clinging to the faith of his fathers. Nor can they fathom the mystery of his survival. According to their way of thinking the Jew should have long ago ceased to exist. Have not mighty nations like the Babylonians, Egyptians, Persians, and Romans appeared on the historic scene and vanished from sight, so that there is no trace left of them? How then did the Jews—a mere handful of people in comparison to the others, and at no time a great military power—manage, in spite of threats, exile, and persecution, to remain alive throughout the centuries?

Unable to find a satisfactory answer to these perplexing questions, the assimilationists to ease their minds prefer to indulge in a good deal of wishful thinking. The Jew, they insist, for his own good as well as the world's, must be made to disappear from the scene. He must be induced, somehow, to renounce his Jewish allegiance, and through baptism, intermarriage, or both, finally become absorbed in the common melting pot of humanity.

To be more specific, these would-be saviors are actually offering the poor "benighted" Jews balm for their injured souls in return for a small favor: they must be willing to commit national hara-kiri.

There are, of course, a number of outstanding men endowed with prophetic insight who speak and write of the Jew with sympathetic understanding. But unfortunately very few people take them seriously. The voices of these sages remain inaudible amidst the noise of the market place.

For the "market place" or the world of "hustle and bustle" is not interested in the truth about the Jew, or for that matter in any other truth. It prefers to live by lies. It is much more pleasant and comfortable.

Mankind, however, cannot continue indefinitely to live and prosper by lies. It is well, therefore, that we throw our prejudices aside, and appraise the Jewish problem for what it is, not for what shortsighted men of little understanding believe it to be.

If the assimilationists were not so blind, they would find the secret of the Jew's survival to lie in his zealous love of God and passion for righteousness. This moral fervor which for some unexplainable reason burned more intensely in the Jew than in any other people, has stiffened his power of resistance against all those who sought to destroy him. It has enabled him, against overwhelming odds, not only to triumph over his enemies, but even to convert some of them to his way of life.

But what a price to pay for being specially gifted! The moral sense so highly developed in the Jew at an early stage of his history, far from receiving approbation, has actually aroused the envy and hatred of the world against him. There is no question that much of the persecution he has withstood since the dispersion is a direct consequence of that very hatred.

Unconsciously most of the anti-Semites and some of the assimilationists of today dislike the Jew because he is the bearer of a high ethical standard that they find it difficult to live up to . The Nazis' mad fury against the Jews can undoubtedly be traced to that pathological complex. They cannot forgive the race for having given birth to Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, Maimonides, Spinoza, Nordau, and Bergson.

Whether the Christian world will be able completely to cure itself of the dreadful malady known as anti-Semitism, time alone will tell. One thing, however, is certain, unless the Christians are willing to revert to barbarism, or some form of primitive savagery they cannot, no matter how hard they try, rid themselves completely of the spiritual contribution they have grudgingly accepted from the Jew. Nor for that matter can the Jew altogether free himself from the influence of Christian culture. Both cultures have intermingled and influenced each other for so long that it has become highly disadvantageous to sever the relationship.

There is a basis then for mutual understanding and coöperation between Jew and Christian if the latter will not allow blind passion to stand in the way of his better judgment. It is absolutely sheer madness to demand of the Jews, as so many supposedly intelligent people do, that they renounce their rich, cultural heritage and cease to function as a separate people. No democracy worthy of the name can exist for any length of time unless it grants full religious and cultural freedom to minorities within and without its borders. If this is not accomplished, the war that is taking such a large toll of human life and goods will have been fought in vain, and the fruits of victory when it comes turned to defeat.

The intelligent, sensitive Jew will insist, therefore, in spite of the terrible ordeal he is undergoing, upon living his own life. He will refuse to sell his soul for a mess of pottage and adopt assimilation as a cure for what ails him. Neither will he take to flight—the return to a separate and secluded spiritual life as advocated by Ludwig Lewisohn as a way out of his dilemma.

Even Zionism he will not accept without some reservations. True, the Zionist movement has helped him to regain his self-respect and has contributed much to his cultural development. But at best Palestine can only accommodate a small number of his people. And he has partaken too much of other cultures and lived too long in other lands to depend solely on Zionism for his salvation.

This state of uncertainty, however, will in no way dampen his spirits or weaken his determination to forge ahead. The real Jew, whether he be socialist or Zionist, reformed or orthodox, refuses to be humble or submissive. He will demand his rights wherever he is and be ready to defend them even at the risk of his life. True to his great prophetic heritage he will be in the forefront of all movements everywhere, Christian and

non-Christian, that aim to establish a more sane and more equitable order.

The genuine Jew will always remain at heart an internationalist. His pulse will continue to beat the heart throbs of humanity. The late Ernest Toller, a champion of the oppressed, who fell a martyr to Nazi oppression truly reveals the humane, cosmopolitan spirit of the Jew in these undying words: "If I were asked where I belonged, I should answer that a Jewish mother had borne me, that Germany had nourished me, Europe had formed me, my home was the earth, and the world my fatherland."

A Church That Is Different

This article has been prepared as a piece of promotion literature for one of our smaller liberal churches, and it is planned at the proper time to distribute it in pamphlet form to the homes in that small city as one means of awakening interest in the church and its minister. It is now published in UNITY in the belief that it will not only suggest help to other churches, but also because the Editor would like to hear from any church at present without a minister, which would like to have a minister and leadership along the lines outlined in this article. The Editor thinks that he could introduce such a church to such a minister.—*John Haynes Holmes.*

If you are not looking for a church that is different perhaps you had better not read this. We do not wish to make anyone dissatisfied with the church they at present attend. We encourage people to attend the church which they like best and we do not like to encourage anyone to come to our church simply because it is different. There should be better reasons for going to a church. Our church *is* different but not because we like it to be different but simply because most of us have a way of looking at life which is different from most churches. If you should ever get to know us you would understand why we have a different church.

Please do not get the notion that we are trying to start a new religion or a new ism. To do that, even unintentionally, we would consider a disaster. There are too many isms now. We are much more interested in getting different kinds of people into our church than in maintaining a different church. What we would like to see, and may see some day, is a reduction of the number of churches that differ from each other, and an increase in the number of churches which contain members who differ from each other. Differences should not be a reason for the existence of different kinds of churches but a reason for getting together so that we may all learn how to disagree agreeably, and like each other even though we do not all think alike. We think that that would be an increase of real religion.

We now have all kinds of people in our church, some very much like you and some very much unlike you. For example, we have all kinds of Christians, some who started life in Protestant homes and some who were baptized as Catholics. We also have some who come from Jewish homes and a few who were born in homes that were neither Jewish nor Christian.

More than that, we have people in our church whose skins are of various colors, pinkish-white, brown, yellow, and black. Like human beings everywhere we are not personally responsible for the color of our skin and do not think that we should be praised or blamed on that account. It is not our fault nor is it to our credit that we are white or black.

We do think, however, that many people may find that they can practice their religion better if they meet with others who have had the same background as they have had, or have the same color as they have. When a Catholic comes to us and wants to join us we always ask him or her to consider thoughtfully whether a happier relationship could not be formed if no attempt was made to leave the Catholic church. We do not like to encourage any to leave a church to which they have long belonged. It is the same with regard to those whom we commonly call colored people. We definitely warn them that we pinkish-white people still have a great many prejudices and that we are often careless about the sensitiveness of other races, and that perhaps they would be much happier and do more good to remain in a church largely composed of their own people. In the same way we talk to our Jewish friends. There are so many fine Hebrew congregations today that we think that in them most Jewish people would find a happy fellowship.

On the other hand we do know several who feel not only that, be they one-time Catholics, Jews, or colored citizens, they will be happier with us but very definitely believe that they ought to be with us, and we are glad to have them. It helps us to understand all humanity better and it helps them to understand us better. We all try to be worthy of the good fellowship which we give to each other. Of course, we often have to be very patient with each other and seek a broad-heartedness in curbing some of our traditional and primitive feelings, but that is all to the good in the making of a better America.

We do not have a rich man's church, but on the other hand, we do not want to be merely a poor man's church. So many rich men were once poor and may be poor again, and so many poor men were once rich and may be rich again, that mere richness and poverty do not seem to us to be very important distinctions. Most of us are neither rich nor poor but just average Americans who have the same difficulties that you have in paying rent or meeting the tax bill, having the installment payments ready or making our income-tax returns. We get concerned about any threat to lower our wages or to lessen our profits, and we all want the cost of living to be kept down. You would find some of us better dressed than others just as you would if you went to a theatre or a lecture, but all these superficial differences we ignore as we do not think them important when we want to be real brothers and sisters, children of one God who treats all of us alike.

Another thing that makes our church different is that you will not only discover that we are both rich and poor, have different religious backgrounds, and

even differences in the color of our skins, but that we also differ very much in our characters. We have bad people as well as good in our church, weak as well as strong characters. We do not like hypocrites so we do not pretend that we are better than each other. If we have any saints, they keep very quiet about their saintliness for we never hear of them. Most of us have had a "past" in which we did things of which we are not very proud today. Most of us are just average, and some of us are below the average. Like the rest of mankind and womankind we still do things of which we can be ashamed. We sometimes tell lies, take things that do not belong to us, slander our neighbors, treat those who work for us unjustly, say unkind things, fail to forgive faults in others, and fail to apologize for our own faults. Some of us may like intoxicating liquors too much, or even commit adultery. You see, we are pretty much like the rest of the world, and though there are times when we act splendidly, there are other times when we are weak and foolish and we secretly hope that no one finds out how very weak we can sometimes be. We know our own hearts and that inner knowledge keeps us from pretending to be something that we are not. The only difference between many of us and the man or woman who was sent to prison for wrongdoing is that they were found out and we were not. Circumstances favored us and we think that we were just lucky, that's all. No matter what your past has been or what you think of yourself now, if you were a member of our church you would find that we would not pretend that we were better than you. We know a little of the failures and disappointments which can be experienced in trying to live a stronger life, and we like to be quietly helpful where we can without imposing ourselves upon you as if we were set apart to reform you. We all need you to help us as much as you may need us to help you.

Perhaps we should warn you that our church is not a Sunday club. In these days when some churches try to invent some new attraction for a church to win supporters, it is forgotten that a church is not an entertainment hall. We believe in clubs of all kinds, but we think that a church should be something else. People join clubs because they think it will give them a good standing in the community, or help their business, or give them a chance to meet "the best people." They provide us with an opportunity to talk about our children, our clothes, our golf, our bridge party winnings, the last dance, the last party, the last book that we read, the last scandal we heard, or the last good story that was told us. Clubs are fine for that sort of thing, but our church is not a club.

Our church cannot promise to improve your standing in the community, for in our church you may meet some people whom you would not like to meet socially, at least, not for the present. It might help your business, but on the other hand, it might hurt your business if it was known you came to our church. A great many of us enjoy dancing and lively parties, but we find that we enjoy them better when we can have them in each other's homes or in places where they function properly. We do not feel that we ought or need to compete with these proper activities. We did not hire our minister because he was a good entertainer, or was able to organize a dance party, or because he was the kind of man whom "the best people" would consider a "social asset" to the pleasure-loving section of the community. We will tell you a little about him presently and you will see why we like him.

When you get to know us you will discover that we attach very little importance to anyone's religion unless it works. If your religion helps to make you a better and stronger man or woman, by all means hold on to it. If it makes you a more pleasant person to meet and work with, by all means hold on to it. If it helps you to worry less, to trust more, and be a real person, by all means hold on to it. Then it is a religion that works.

If, on the other hand, your religion makes you miserable and sour in your disposition, there must be something wrong with it. If you are trying to hold on to your religion simply because it was your father's or your mother's religion before it was yours, if it is loved by you simply because it is full of beauty and ancientness, but does not affect your character very much, perhaps you should consider whether it would not be better to put it in a glass case in some museum among other lovely antiques, where you can go and look at it from time to time. If, on the other hand, your religion is just something to satisfy your craving for newness and novelty, something just invented by some thinker or popular lecturer, fascinating because it is mysterious or not understood by ordinary folk, perhaps you had best question yourself and see if you have not got hold of something that belongs more to the circus where freaks are displayed, rather than something real which will work for all sorts and conditions of men and women. We find that the religion that works best is one that is completely human; by that we mean, it must be practical for all humanity. It must be human, as love and home are human. It must be human, as good fellowship and kindness are human. It must be human, as trust in the almost unfathomable will of God is human, something that warms the heart and clears the mind, and is not just a pet philosophy for our needs alone.

Perhaps one of the things that you would notice which makes our church different would be the fact that we have no Ladies Aid Society to collect pennies for the saving of the heathen, so-called. We think that other nations may have their own ideas as to how best to live their lives. If they lived in our city we would certainly ask some of them to come and tell us what their ideas are and we have a notion that we might learn something from them to our advantage. We are not interested in compassing sea and land to make converts. If people like us and join us, that is their affair. It is human to like people that like us, but we would never force ourselves upon others, nor would we try to frighten them by telling them of dreadful things that might happen to them if they did not believe as we believed.

We never dogmatize. By that we mean we never claim that our church is the only true church, and we never, never say that we must all believe the same thing. Each person in our church is free to believe only that which each thinks is true. We have no creed that we ask our members to sign or repeat. We are quite sure that for some people some other church than ours would suit them better. We cannot all be alike, and most of us would not want to live in a world where everybody believed the same. It would be very uninteresting, to say the least.

There are some people who say that they do not believe in God at all. That is all right with us. The

three little letters of our English alphabet, the "G", the "O", and the "D" spell the word "God," but it is only a word, and all words are just symbols. It stands for something that it is frequently impossible to express by any symbol, usually something finer and greater. If anyone thinks that we should use more words to express that something, such as "The Soul of Nature," or "The Life Force," or "The Spirit of the Universe," or even maintains that we should say nothing, keep silent, and use no word at all, we would not object. We use the word "God" largely because we have got used to it, much as we use the word "man." We do not know what either of these words really means. Both words are symbols and mysteries. Every generation learns a little, a very little about their meaning, and frequently the little we learn is found out later to be wrong or needs revision and correction. What we do care about is that each person in the church shall be as intelligent as possible about what he believes, and have patience with the rest of us who are dull of mind or shallow in our emotions and imaginations. We think that believing in God is something like believing in love. We know that it is more than mere sex attraction, but we cannot analyze that something more and tell of its component parts, how it originated, how powerful it can become, or how long it will last, or why it may decay. Perhaps that is why men have said that God is love. To merely say that does not prove that he is. Certainly he seems to do some things that do not look to us like love at all, but even "nature red in tooth and claw" does not prove that he is not love. It only proves that our hypothesis is not working as well as it should and that we probably have something yet to learn, and that perhaps after all God is something vaster and more beautiful than even love.

What we mean by broad-heartedness is something different from mere broad-mindedness. To be broad-minded is simply to have a liberal intellectual view of life, whether we apply it to religion or something else. You may or you may not be a better, finer man for being broad-minded. To be broad-hearted, however, requires more character and grit. It is something that has to be applied with emotion rather than with clear thinking. It is a generous thing that makes even narrow-minded people like you and makes you like them in return. It is something that makes you patient with others and forgiving of faults. It makes you humble in your own estimate of yourself so that you do not boast about your religion.

Broad-heartedness is better than trying to save the so-called heathen. It expresses itself when we get behind all the good things that are being done in the community and makes us good citizens. In our church we do not do such good as a church but as individuals. We help the Red Cross and take an active interest in the education of our children and the children of others. We try to assist all movements for better housing and sanitation. We love to take our part in all cooperative enterprises where no one seeks a selfish profit but everyone seeks a mutual advantage. We help to make our city beautiful and safe, a place where there can be numberless opportunities for all forms of neighborliness. We do what we can to help the underprivileged get holidays in the country and by the sea. We get to know our new Americans who are trying to make themselves at home in this country, and we try to keep up to date on the affairs in their homelands, and all the time work for the just and peaceful settlement of international disputes. All these things we do as individuals, not as a church, for our church is an organization made up of individuals who have a variety of opinions on such subjects and who belong to different political parties. As members of our church we feel that it is the church's job to create broad-hearted men and women of good will, and then let each one in his own way promote such good will among others.

Of course, many of the things that we have mentioned above about our church you would not discover until you came to know us well. That is why we have mentioned them first. There are other things that you would notice the first Sunday that you visited us. For example, you might wonder about the hymns and songs which are sung in our church. You would probably know the tunes but you would discover that the words were real poetry and often very beautiful, and utterly devoid of wishy-washy sentimentality. It is very foolish, we think, to ask people to sing in church what they would not naturally sing in their own homes. We think that hymns should have as much serious meaning and inspiration as anything else that we do.

You would also notice that when our minister reads from the pulpit he sometimes reads from the Bible as in other churches, but the Bible that he reads from is a modern Bible, in the language of today rather than in the antiquated language of centuries ago. It is wonderful how much simpler the Bible becomes when we read it in this way. You would also notice that he reads from other books, for he considers that our great poets and inspiring writers are also scriptures that deserve to be read in church. In this church of ours that must seem so different to you, we think that you would be most surprised at our prayers. When our minister prays he does not ask God for anything. He thinks that Jesus knew what he was talking about when he said, "Your heavenly father knows what ye have need of before ye ask him." So, our minister says, why ask him? A trustful child usually leaves all questions about supplies to its father, and we think we should do the same when talking to God. It certainly makes prayer time more pleasant not to have to "panhandle the Almighty" about matters which are no concern of ours. When our minister prays in public he simply talks to God, and, as one of our members once said, "talks to God as if he knew him." Sometimes, like the old-fashioned Quakers, we do not talk to God in spoken words at all but just sit silent in his presence. We find that it helps a lot to quietly remember at such moments that the invisible God is an enfolding presence, never far from any one of us. In that golden silence of meditation we have found more courage for living than we ever have found in spoken prayers, or from the most beautiful written prayers. There is so much to tell God about silently and so much that we could not utter in the presence of other people. God knows about it without us telling him.

If you like a sermon to be a piece of grand oratory, you would probably be disappointed in our minister's sermons. He not only is not an orator but he thinks that the pulpit is not the place for wonderful orations such as he might give in a public lecture hall. On the other hand, he does not stand in the pulpit and quietly read us some fine essay in perfect English that he has composed the week before. Of course, we would

like to know of anything he wrote, but we would like to read it by ourselves. Some of us when we hear sermons read just naturally drop off to sleep. We have had a hard week's work and the reading voice lulls us whether we want it to or not. Our minister, when he preaches, simply talks to us in the same voice and in the same manner he would use if he were talking to us in our homes. He probably has given much thought to what he says but he says it as if he had just thought of it, and it comes from his heart and mind warmed by his own experience. He seems to be preaching to himself as much as to us and that helps us to think truthfully about him and remember that he is just as human as the rest of us. Not only would a child understand him but he often has a little talk specially for the children who are present in the congregation.

We do not go in for ceremonies much in our church. We are not against them but we do not think that they are very important. We know that they help some people, but for some reason the people who come to our church are not the kind of people who get much help from the mere performance of some time-honored form. If, however, you or your family would like to have your children baptized, our minister will baptize them. We have seen him do it beautifully with flowers as well as with water. He can make a marriage or a funeral just as beautiful. If, however, you felt that it was a relic of a childish age or a piece of old foolishness to have your children baptized, or to have a church wedding, or a fuss made at your funeral, it is all right with us. Your children can be just as good without baptism, and your marriage can be just as happy without an ecclesiastical "solemnization." And it will not make any difference to your future life whether you have a funeral service or not. We have long ago learned that a ceremony is only an outward sign, a symbol, and that what really matters is something that cannot be seen and is known only to our own hearts.

Let us tell you, in closing, a little about our minister. We like him first because he speaks our language. He has no unctuous utterances or sanctimonious expressions. He speaks as we all speak. We see a lot of him outside the pulpit for he comes often to our homes and we know the kind of man he is. We think that it helps him to be a better minister in that he has not always been a minister. He has been a physician, a businessman, a soldier, and a journalist, and he knows from travel in many countries a great deal about human experience, a knowledge which has been deepened by many troubles in his own life. He has known what it is to be rich and also to be poor, sick and well, happy and unhappy.

We also like him because he is no longer a young man, for in a few more years he will have reached the proverbial three score years and ten, although he seems much younger and stronger. If he were a young man we would not feel as free to tell him our troubles or ask him to enter into our happiness. We like him also because he is a welcome preacher in other churches. He has preached in all kinds, orthodox and unorthodox, Baptist and Presbyterian, Congregational and Methodist, in Salvation Army barracks, and in Quaker Meeting Houses. Strange as it may seem to some, he is even well thought of by those who utterly disagree with his views. The last time that he was in Rome he had an audience with the Pope, and in this country some of the things that he writes are accepted and well paid for by such outstanding Catholic publications as *The Catholic World* and the popular magazine *Ave Maria*. We have even heard of the Mother Superior of a Catholic convent reading something that he had written to the nuns after their evening prayers. He has met and known men and women of many lands and religions who have had great influence on our times, and these friendships have widened his own interests and understanding. He is often amused at one curious thing in his life, namely, that he was born in Great Britain without a name that he could legally call his own. Perhaps that is one reason why he has used various names when writing his books, for in the Library of Congress his books appear to have been written by five or six different individuals, all of them *noms de plume* of our minister.

Another thing that we like about our minister is that like most of the rest of us, he has had a "past," by which we mean that he acknowledges he has done things that he would never dream of doing today. He says that he has never been in prison except to visit prisoners, but that many years ago he might have been put in prison for things that he did. The hundreds of articles which he has written have been printed in scores of leading newspapers all over this country and in Europe, but he says that he remembers the time when he was sore afraid that the newspapers would print some ugly truth or rumor about him that he could not have explained without personal embarrassment. He never talks about that "past," but we like him the better for it. It seems to make him more a minister, a man who wants to understand all kinds of people. We hope that some day he will be your minister too.

There is much more that we could say about our church that is so different and about our minister who is so different, but we will not do so this time, as we hope that you will come and visit our church for a few Sundays—come several Sundays so as to understand us better—and get to know what we are trying to be to the thousands of people in this community who do not go to any church. We feel that they are our parish, and our minister will be glad to help any of them whether they come to our church or not.

"Reason and ignorance, the opposites of each other, influence the great bulk of mankind. If either of these can be rendered sufficiently extensive in a country, the machinery of government goes easily on. Reason shows itself; and ignorance submits to whatever is dictated to it.

What is government more than the management of the affairs of a nation? It is not, and from its nature cannot be, the property of any particular man or family, but of the whole community, at whose expense it is supported; and though by force and contrivance it has been usurped into an inheritance, the usurpation cannot alter the right of things. Sovereignty, as a matter of right, appertains to the nation only, and not to any individual; and a nation has at all times an inherent, indefeasible right to abolish any form of government it finds inconvenient, and to establish such as accords with its interest, disposition, and happiness.

In a well-constituted republic, government requires no belief from man beyond what his reason authorizes; and as it is best supported when best understood, the human faculties act with boldness, and acquire, under this form of government, a gigantic manliness."

—*Thomas Paine*

Humanism and World Leadership

ARCHIE J. BAHM

Theories of leadership resolve themselves to three: "Men make history." "History makes men." "Men and history make history and men." According to the first, the course of history is determined by powerful personalities who guide the progress and regress of peoples. If a gifted leader is great enough, he can guide or goad men toward his goals. According to the second, men are made by their environments. They do what their biological and cultural inheritance determines that they shall do. If they happen to fall before destructive forces, failure is their fate. If they happen to gain good fortune or fame, they are garlanded as great. According to the third, both the first and second are each partially correct. How would Humanism fare under each of these theories?

If men make history, who are the men who might lead Humanism? Without criticizing contemporary contributors to Humanism's foothold in history, let us look to the future. The past has taught us the value of personalized leadership. Jesus and Buddha, Confucius and Muhammad, Zoroaster and Lao-Tse, each is a personality standing out as a name, a slogan, a rallying-cry, a living example of the idealized way of life, a saint for deification. Would the cause of Humanism be better served by its setting up a seer-saint? If so, how should he be selected, how could he be chosen? Should he be self-chosen, like Jesus, Buddha, Muhammad, and then socially chosen when he wins confidence that he is the acceptable one? Should he be sought for with endless patience, like the Tibetan Dalai Lama or the theosophist Krishnamurti? The world of tomorrow will hardly wonder and marvel at simple myths and mysteries like those of yesterday. The man of tomorrow must be steeped in the myths and mysteries of science, for these are the miracles to which modern men-in-the-street pay homage. If search is to be made for a leader, let there be thought about qualifications, about whether he should be sought full-grown or cherished from childhood; about how to defeat potential disasters from later debunking. If Humanists believe that the fortunes of Humanism are to be found under the theory that men make history, then it is time for another John the Baptist to say, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord."

The second theory of leadership is gaining favor today among scientists, though the first still pleases the popular mind. History makes men because men are products of cultural determination. When a situation arises demanding a certain type of leadership, then someone finds himself forced into that position of leadership. The kind of leadership that arises is determined by the kind of need for leadership that has arisen in followers. If this theory is correct, those who would be leaders should find the kind of need for leadership as yet unmet and should let themselves stand as symbols of that type of need. If they wisely discern the trend of need and get there first, they almost automatically become leaders in the movement.

In *Can Christianity Save Civilization?* W. M. Horton warns that Protestantism is on the wane, partly because the business man's civilization, the society of individual enterprise and laissez faire, to which it gave rise, is failing to be as adequate as it once was. He labors at length to illustrate the interrelations of religion and other phases of culture. He believes that Christianity can save civilization but only through the transforming of itself from a failing formalism into some new vital soul-serving movement. Perhaps Humanism can become this new Christianity.

If religions grow and survive because they not only are integrated with, but integrate, the culture of their time, then the success of Humanism in becoming the religion of the future will depend upon whether it can integrate the culture of the future. If we can foresee the structure of the culture of the future and see whether or not Humanism is suited to unify it, perhaps we can at least faintly foretell its fortunes.

Limiting consideration of the culture of the future to three traits, may we suggest that it will be more *universal,* more *scientific,* and more *popular.*

The culture of the future will be more *universal* in the sense that the cultural traits of different cultural traditions will increasingly intermingle. This will mean that the world's religious variations will more closely confront each other, will have to come to terms with each other. If the culture of the future is to achieve integration, then the religion of the future must somehow achieve unity among the various religious traditions which promise to persist in some measure. This means that the religion of the future must be tolerant. Its tolerance must be so comprehensive as to include some of the great differences that now separate sects. This may mean that the fundamental credo must be very generally, even vaguely, stated. Universal religious unity, like the unity desired by politicians in democratic political campaigns, may best be served by a platform of objectives not too specifically stated, yet obviously worth living for. If Humanism states its doctrines too precisely, it rules itself out of competition as a bidder for world leadership. If Humanists become absolutely intolerant of theism, rather than merely relegating it to secondary importance, they can bury their hopes immediately. If they insist, also, upon terminological uniformity, when some men find new interpretations of old terms more satisfying (perhaps as more suited to the solidarity of their slowly changing communities), then their exclusiveness will cost both them and the world they seek to unify much useless conflict. Another challenge which Humanism may have to face, if it proceeds to undertake the task of tolerant integration, is the possibility of having to give up its name in favor of the name which some other organized movement with the same objectives has already more firmly established. If, for example, the Brahmo Samaj or communism or Christianity becomes so modified as to be identical with Humanism in aims, insistence upon the name, Humanism, for the movement might become an insuperable setback. The problem of merging seats of authority and salaried interests of authorities in such a merger might also have to be met. If Humanism seeks to serve the culture of the future, it needs now to set its course as a course of tolerance of the kind that a universal religion will require.

The culture of the future will be more *scientific* in the sense that its guiding assumptions will be grounded in the conclusions of science. So if the religion of the future is to integrate the culture of the future, it will

have to be not only at home in science, but also the unifier of scientific controversies and of scientific theory with popular practice. The popular communicants of the religion of tomorrow will trust their faith, which will be largely a blind faith, in the eminently successful myths of science. The "myths of science" are "useful fictions" to some critical minds, or "operational ideas" to others. But to believers, they are the facts. They constitute "the truth." The religion of the future must succor the spiritually sick who suffer from the failure of their faith in science to bring them the happiness which prospects promise. Humanism is at home in the world of science. Indeed, it is largely a product of the impact of science upon the stiff ribs of traditional religious organizations. But if Humanism expects to succeed in assuming the responsibility for binding the culture of the future, it had better look ahead to the task of binding the spiritual wounds of those unwittingly caught in the cogs of cultural change and of those whose simple faith in science can no more stand to be shaken than can some now survive the loss of their faith in God.

The culture of the future will be more *popular* in the sense that mass appeal and mass participation will increase. Mass production and mass consumption of culture will continue to increase, not merely in machinery, food products, literature and education, but especially in the field of social security. The culture of the future will focus its efforts in services to the masses rather than the classes. And the individual will find himself best served by, will find himself best able to serve through, some system of collective security. This will mean greater emphasis upon practical political programs instead of church services. This will involve nearly 100 per cent of the people, instead of some 50 per cent represented by present United States church memberships. This will function effectively seven days a week instead of merely an hour or two on Sunday. This will permeate every type of activity instead of merely prayer, worship, preaching, and singing. The religion of the future, if it is to reintegrate the culture of the future, must somehow reunite itself with the vital flow of human interests. Separation of church and state institutions may be a wise practice, but separation of religion and social endeavor is eventually fatal to both. Can Humanism function as a force spiritually integrating masses of people seeking social security? Or will Humanism remain mere intellectualism of philosophers dreaming of utopia?

Humanism has competitors in the competition for world leadership through mass appeal. Even though Christianity is, as H. S. Tigner in *Our Prodigal Son Culture* says, a "sick horse," but still worth betting on, Humanism is still a "dark horse," in the race now being led by communism and Nazism. Passing over the Nazi enigma, we may observe that communism is already internationally established, has its historical tradition, its saints and sinners, its youth movement, its army, its practical social security program, and already a record of successes. Already multitudes have been willing to die for religious communism. But who is willing to die for Humanism? Humanists may hope that in a long-winded race certain advantages may yet bring victory. Humanism is not essentially atheistic, while communism "missed the bus" in avowing atheism, thus alienating many established Christian brotherhoods which are gradually ripening into socialistic cells. Humanism still has the opportunity to make a cardinal virtue of tolerance, whereas the dogmatism of organized communism seems at times too violently exclusive. Dark horse Humanism may achieve world leadership through permeation of victorious or revived democracies. Even communist or Nazi victories, however, should not give rise to complete discouragement. Humanism may even merge with and thus modify any political movement which permits modification in the direction of increasing the range and quality of human values.

According to the third theory of leadership, the first two are half-truths. Perhaps the truth is that some historical dialectic determines the limits within which men can modify the course of events through which they live, yet the particular pressures of each occasion are the products of its personnel. Humanists should search history for humanistic saints, and perhaps the humanistic Jesus should not be overlooked; should surrender allegiance to some contemporary symbol; should train a future sacrificial priesthood of humans utterly devoted to human welfare. Humanists should seek also to place their representatives in positions where the need for Humanism is being felt. Humanism needs to be presented as the religion of scientists, the religion of modern democracy, the religion underlying many humanitarian movements. When the treaty of peace, terminating the present war and charting the outlines for the new world order, is schemed and signed, Humanists should be on hand to place a signature in the name of humanity. This will be an especially crucial time for tying humanity's faith in its future into the institutional structure of the world to come.

Immediate next steps haunting Humanists are twofold: to set its theoretical house in order and to bring the "good news" to their neighbors. (1) So long as doubts about doctrine beset Humanists, their faith is hampered and dampered. If they remain somewhat disunited, they cannot expect to unite the world. They now face the problem of refining their formulation of faith so that it can unite the world of tomorrow. Although Humanism is deliberately dynamic, it is still possible to demarcate its limits of flexibility and, more important still, to clarify the tremendous extent of its limits of tolerance. (2) Modern promotion methods make much of publicity, but Humanists must not overlook a method of propagation still the most effective. Person-to-person progress gives best evidence of vitality. If it is not worth telling your neighbor, it is hardly worth telling the world. If you cannot convince your neighbor, it will be hard to convince the masses of the world. Humanists can discern indices of Humanism's chances for world leadership best by considering the vitality of Humanism in his own heart and by considering the vitalizing effect of the "good news" upon his neighbor.

"Good morale is as important to defense as guns and planes. Morale in a democracy is unity of purpose based on common understanding. That kind of morale thrives on free and full discussion. The responsibility of promoting democratic discussion falls on our traditional institutions which we have set up for enlightenment—our colleges and schools. . . ."

Paul V. McNutt—1941.

The Study Table

Authentic Voice

FOR MY PEOPLE. *By Margaret Walker. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press (Yale Series of Younger Poets). $2.00.*

Margaret Walker, a young Negro, now professor of English at Livingstone College, Salisbury, North Carolina, is not the first true poet to be discovered by the editors of the Yale Series of Younger Poets, but she is most decidedly one of the best. Stephan Vincent Benét, in his laudatory foreword to this first volume of her poetry, finds not only high promise in what she has written but actual achievement of exceptional merit. Miss Walker is first of all an authentic voice of the Negro—"this is the song of her people," writes Mr. Benét, "of her part of America," characterized by "a sincerity at times disquieting." If these poems cut deep, it is not only because of her "candor," but also because of her mastery of the form in which she chooses to speak. Her versatility is remarkable, running all the way from free verse of truly Biblical sonority and beauty to racy dialect ballads. Miss Walker has an extraordinary talent. Not since Countee Cullen has so fresh and original a voice been heard.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Unfinished Business of Democracy

BROTHERS UNDER THE SKIN. *By Carey McWilliams. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. 325 pp. $3.00.*

This is not, as you might suppose, another book on Negro-white relations in the United States. It concerns all non-white peoples in our country—Indians, Mexicans, Orientals, and Negroes. It takes a look at our mixed populations in Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

We are slowly beginning to realize that we all live in "One World," and that white and non-white must go forward *together* or go backward *together.*

The first chapter is "The Non-Vanishing Indian" and tells many things that the other parts of the population need to know about the real "natives." Perhaps the chapter that impressed this reviewer most is the one on "The Forgotten Mexican." The author states the problem clearly:

> When we broadcast Good Neighbor programs in Spanish, it seldom occurs to us that there is a sizable Mexican population in our midst and that the Good Neighbor Policy might very well start here, at home, within our own borders. If the Good Neighbor Policy is to succeed, then we must promptly reconsider the problem presented by this Mexico that lies within the United States.

Another chapter that is worth the price of the book is the one on Puerto Rico. Not many inhabitants of the mainland know much about these brothers on the Islands. This chapter gives information that every intelligent American should have. We are rightly interested in Greece and Poland, but we should no longer ignore a problem that is all our own. The very circumstances of this global war compel us to go forward with the unfinished business of democracy.

"What are race problems," says McWilliams, "are not biological problems; they are not insoluble; they are susceptible to social invention and intelligent manipulation." The findings of the social sciences no longer permit intelligent people to talk about inferior or superior races.

In the concluding chapter, "Outline for Action," the author makes several suggestions. Our first assignment is to establish the principle that, *as a matter of national policy,* there shall be no discrimination against individuals because of race, color, creed, or country of national origin. In the next place, Congress should enforce the Bill of Rights—that means among other things to outlaw the poll tax and end Jim Crowism on all types of interstate carriers.

He quotes Hortense Powdermaker who makes the excellent suggestion that "the basic principles of anthropology should be taught in all secondary schools as one means of combatting race prejudice."

As we deal with these problems within the confines of the United States, we must realize that we are dealing with a problem that concerns not only our own welfare, but the future peace of the world. We must be acutely aware that it is not only the color of America that has changed: the color of the world has changed.

JAMES M. YARD.

A Strong and Quiet Optimism

THERE IS TODAY. *By Josephine Lawrence. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. 331 pp. $2.50.*

The simple folk and the homely scenes of American life are the stuff of Josephine Lawrence's novels, of which this is the ninth, and out of this material she has created strong and convincing stories, stories whose tragedies touch you deeply and whose honesty, gaiety, and warm humanity cannot fail but stir you. In such novels as *Years Are So Long, A Good Home with Nice People, But You Are Young,* to mention only three, she has shown herself a keen observer, a truthful interpreter, and a craftsman whose art has steadily grown in quality. She is thoroughly at home in scenes of American middle-class life. Everywhere her style and treatment breathe a genuine affection for her characters and the America they represent, and nowhere more so than in *There Is Today,* a quiet story full of pathos, rich in color, and so timely as to theme.

This is the story of Andrew and Candace Thane, two young white-collar workers, who have decided that, war or no war, they are going to snatch the bit of happiness life holds for them: to get married, to have a baby, despite the innuendos and catty gossip of their neighbors who, themselves quite beyond the necessity of deciding great personal issues, find it so easy to criticize two young people much in love and bravely determined to take what measure of happiness may still be theirs. For, so these splendid youngsters think, whatever the uncertainties of tomorrow, "there is today."

In their apartment, only the landlady, Sarah Daffodil, and that dear old couple, the Peppercorns, show any degree of understanding and sympathy for these two, and, of course, there is their own group of friends, healthy and entirely normal young Americans, who chatter frankly and revealingly about the problems that their generation must face. Typical of the unfriendly "older set," so ready with their advice and admonitions NOT to do this and surely to do that, is Toni Fitts, always boasting about her day crowded with defense work for which she must spend so much time dressing properly and having her hair appropriately done. She is always "selling patriotism" to others and becomes much upset over the unwillingness of those

individuals, like Candace Thane, who claim it their privilege to decide for themselves when and how best to serve their country.

Emma Waters is the typical hysterical hoarder who believes that any rumor concerning shortages and rationing is a green light for starting a frantic campaign of buying sundry articles and foods. Her faith in life and mankind is almost destroyed when thieves break into her cottage and steal her precious store of hoarded treasures. King Waters is that type of stuffed-shirt first World War veteran whose favorite themes are his own doubtful exploits as soldier, his availability for a commission without too much work, and the softness and doubtful patriotism of the younger generation, which, like Andrew Thane, does not hurry fast enough to don uniforms and take up arms to suit this grim armchair warrior.

Through the eyes of men and women like you and me we see America preparing to take her place in the war, and we learn again that it is the character of America's "ordinary citizens" and their attitudes in this crisis that are going to determine not only the contribution we shall make to the conflict but also to the shape and quality of the world of tomorrow. *There Is Today* preaches no cheap hedonistic philosophy, but a wholesome realism, a strong and quiet optimism, and an intelligent fortitude. We shall need them all.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

A Guide to Better Preaching

THE CHRISTIAN DUTY. *By Robert Worth Frank. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. $2.00.*

This is the kind of book we have been anticipating from Doctor Frank. It is a series of sixteen sermons which take their origin from the ethical imperative of the prophets. The author says: "If the ethical emphasis seems foremost in these sermons it is because of my conviction that this accent is always in peril of being slurred over." Doctor Frank recognizes the "situs of preaching" in the following words: "The purpose of these messages is to present this Gospel as a saving faith for those whose fate it is to live in this crucial historic epoch." And this "crucial historic epoch" ought to produce great preaching. Doctor Frank has set a high standard and his volume may well be used both as an inspiration and as a guide to better preaching in America.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

In Reply to Mr. Collier

TO UNITY:

Due to the illness of William Floyd, editor of the *Arbitrator*, I feel it is incumbent upon me to answer Mr. Collier's strictures about the *Arbitrator* in your June issue. In his letter he presents the Rationalist Press Association of London and the *Arbitrator* as examples of "intellectual arrogance." Far from being intellectually arrogant, the *Arbitrator* is the only publication known to me which in every issue contains the following: "If misstatement of facts occurs, a correction from one better informed will be welcome." That this is no mere form is shown by the fact that for twenty-four years every correction made has been printed. But as Mr. Wilson points out in his letter following Mr. Collier's, Mr. Floyd is no mere iconoclast but a genuine positive Humanist. In fact, the *Arbitrator* claims to be the only publication that advocates as a cure for human ills the consistent use of truth, democracy, pacifism, socialism, and Humanism, *i.e.*, all of them. Whether one agrees with all or not, it must be conceded that they are constructive rather than destructive.

As a member of the Rationalist Press Association, I feel I must say a word in its behalf also. Mr. Wilson has already pointed out that there are many important members who are genuinely humanistic, and I wish to add that the organization as a whole is on a very high level. The R.P.A. defines Rationalism as "the mental attitude which unreservedly accepts the supremacy of reason and aims at establishing a system of philosophy and ethics verifiable by experience and independent of all arbitrary assumptions or authority." This seems to be a worthy, even a noble, mental attitude, one which would not hurt even Mr. Collier. For a great many years the R.P.A. has published in cheap form for the masses of the English-speaking world, as well as for the so-called "upper" classes, the classics in the history of humanistic thought. It has also kept up with the times through its publication of current books, its monthly paper, *The Literary Guide*, and its *Rationalist Annual*.

I have a feeling that Mr. Collier still has some "theological hang-overs" which have been trod upon by the R.P.A. and the *Arbitrator*. I have had the privilege in years past to know some leaders of the Ethical Union, including the late John Lovejoy Elliott, and their Ethical Culture has seemed to be indistinguishable from Humanism. It has been a pleasure for me to reprint in large part Dr. J. Hutton Hynd's fine article on "Our Non-Christian Allies: What Are *They* Fighting For?" in the June issue of the *Arbitrator*. The coöperation of New York Ethical Leaders with Humanists in organizing the Conference on the Scientific Spirit and the Democratic Faith has been exemplary. Mr. Collier does not seem to be a representative Ethical Culturist, even if to him "they are all out of step but Jim."

SHERMAN D. WAKEFIELD,
New York, N. Y. *Associate Editor.*

Peace Terms—Questions for Pacifists

TO UNITY:

As an admirer of sincere, consistent pacifists, whose views of war I cannot share, may I put some straight and simple questions to the Philadelphia Quakers, as well as to Doctor Holmes, apropos of the Minute adopted at the March 30th meeting, quoted with earnest and complete approval in an editorial comment in the June issue of UNITY?

The Minute declares that "an immediate-peace-by-consultation can be made morally better and more permanent than any peace which might be won by continuing the war." Do the good, conscientious Quakers really believe that the United Nations could "consult" Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini, negotiate with them in a reasonable and civilized manner, and reach a morally satisfactory agreement? Do they believe that such worshippers of brute force would accept peace terms that could possibly meet the basic requirements of justice, humanity, and common decency? Would they seriously ask the Poles, the Dutch, the Greeks, the Norwegians, the Danes, the Jews to trust Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini, to rely on pledges and formulas duly signed by them?

Further, is it not fair to ask the Quakers and Doctor Holmes to tell us just what peace terms *they* themselves would be willing and ready to accept and regard as preferable to continuing the struggle? Those who talk of peace by consultation and negotiation surely have in mind certain proposals and terms. Why not give these terms to us non-pacifists, who hate and detest war and fight only because we are convinced that slavery, barbarism, and psychopathic malignity in government are infinitely worse than war? Generalities about peace-by-consultation are easy but wholly futile. They make no impression whatever. We are entitled to particulars and specific proposals.

La Jolla, California. VICTOR S. YARROS.